

App. No. 09/892,677  
Amendment dated March 30, 2004  
Reply to final Office action of January 22, 2004

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-20 are rejected. Claims 1, 11 and 18 are amended to more distinctly claim the invention. No new matter has been added. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,463,427 issued to *Wu*. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Wu* in view of *Pei-ya Liu*. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The Office Action rejected independent Claim 1 by citing a procedure described in *Wu* for searching objects during synchronization. Claim 1, as amended, recites, "if a particular modification identified in the manifest is interpreted as being associated with a change event for an object not on the list of objects within the mobile data store, altering the manifest to reflect that the particular modification is associated with an add event for the object not on the list of objects." The limitations recited in amended Claim 1 are significantly different from the procedure in *Wu* cited by the Office Action.

*Wu* is directed to creating, comparing, and updating objects in an object store. For example, "[s]ynchronization manager implements the synchronization protocol to allow a comparison between corresponding objects stored in object store in mobile device and object store in desktop computer, to receive objects from object store, and to update objects in object store." (col. 6, lines 22-26) "[A]pplication programming interfaces allow the creation of databases for different types of objects, and allow application programs to write and read property names and values to and from respective objects within object store." (col. 6, lines 36-39)

*Wu* does not disclose anything about "if a particular modification identified in the manifest is interpreted as being associated with a change event for an object not on the list of objects within the mobile data store, altering the manifest to reflect that the particular modification is associated with an add event for the object not on the list of objects," as recited in amended Claim 1. Thus, the *Wu* procedure is different and, more significantly, does not

App. No. 09/892,677  
Amendment dated March 30, 2004  
Reply to final Office action of January 22, 2004

anticipate the method as recited in Applicants' Claim 1. For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that the invention recited in amended independent Claim 1 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by *Wu* and is allowable.

The Office Action rejected independent Claims 11 and 18 by citing the same procedure in *Wu* that was used to reject Claim 1. Claim 11, as amended, recites, "if a record in the manifest is interpreted as being associated with a change event for an object that is not in the sync state table, altering the action associated with the corresponding object to an add event." Claim 18 recites, "including in the sync state table any objects identified in the manifest that are associated with a change event but are not included in the data objects of the first data store."

As discussed above, *Wu* discloses creating, comparing, and updating objects in an object store. *Wu* does not disclose "if a record in the manifest is interpreted as being associated with a change event for an object that is not in the sync state table, altering the action associated with the corresponding object to an add event," or "including in the sync state table any objects identified in the manifest that are associated with a change event but are not included in the data objects of the first data store." Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the invention taught by independent Claims 11 and 18 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by *Wu* and is allowable.


As discussed above, independent Claims 1, 11 and 18, as amended, are allowable. Thus, dependent Claims 2-10, 12-17, 19 and 20 are allowable for at least the same reasons that the base claims on which they rely are allowable, and notice to that effect is solicited.

App. No. 09/892,677  
Amendment dated March 30, 2004  
Reply to final Office action of January 22, 2004

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy P. Sullivan  
Registration No. 47,981  
Direct Dial: 206.342.6254  
JJF/ab

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P. O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
206.342.6200

